UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
26th meeting
held on
Monday, 15 November 1993
at 10 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 26th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. von WAGNER (Germany)

CONTENTS

ACTION ON ALL DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AGENDA ITEMS (continued)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of the publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/48/SR.26
10 December 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

93-82367 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

ACTION ON ALL DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AGENDA ITEMS (continued)

Cluster 9

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.22

1. Mr. CHANDRA (India), introducing draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.22, said that since the forty-third session of the General Assembly the qualitative improvement of weapons and weapons systems and their impact on the global security environment had prompted considerable concern. The draft resolution focused on a different aspect of science and technology from other draft resolutions on the subject and requested the Secretary-General to follow up his interim report prepared pursuant to General Assembly resolution 45/60. Stressing the need to harness scientific and technological developments for peaceful purposes, he expressed the hope that the draft resolution would receive broad support when it was put to the vote, thereby reflecting the concern of the international community on the matter.

Announcement of sponsors

2. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the following countries had joined the sponsors of the draft resolutions listed: A/C.1/48/L.6: Democratic People's Republic of Korea; A/C.1/48/L.8/Rev.2: Paraguay, Portugal and Italy; A/C.1/48/L.11: Philippines; A/C.1/48/L.15: Philippines; A/C.1/48/L.19: Philippines; A/C.1/48/L.26: Paraguay; A/C.1/48/L.27: Zimbabwe; A/C.1/48/L.28: Malta; A/C.1/48/L.31: Paraguay; A/C.1/48/L.33: Philippines; A/C.1/48/L.34: Democratic People's Republic of Korea; A/C.1/48/L.35: Philippines; A/C.1/48/L.36: Malta, Venezuela and Zimbabwe; A/C.1/48/L.37: Democratic People's Republic of Korea; A/C.1/48/L.40: Guinea and Guinea-Bissau; A/C.1/48/L.42: Azerbaijan, Israel and Micronesia; A/C.1/48/L.44: Italy; A/C.1/48/L.46: Paraguay.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.7/Rev.1

3. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Haiti and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

4. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.7/Rev.1 was adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.17

5. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Bolivia and Haiti had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

6. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.17 was adopted.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.22

7. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Honduras, Nigeria and Panama had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

8. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Armenia, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: France, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey.

9. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.22 was adopted by 104 votes to 4, with 29 abstentions.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.30

10. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Austria, Chile, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Greece, Honduras, Luxembourg, Panama, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovak Republic, Slovenia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

11. A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan,

Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

12. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.30 was adopted by 133 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.*

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.47

13. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Costa Rica, Latvia, Lithuania, Panama, and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

14. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.47 was adopted.

Explanations of vote or position

15. Mr. WESTON (United Kingdom), explaining his delegation's position and that of the delegation of France with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.30, said that given the vital importance of science and technology in international security and disarmament matters, there should be full cooperation among Member States with a view to forging the necessary consensus. It was regrettable that

---

* The delegation of Kyrgyzstan subsequently informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.

(Mr. Weston, United Kingdom)

the efforts along those lines during the session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission held earlier that year had not been entirely successful. As a result some crucial issues remained unresolved, and so there were still no agreed guidelines on the role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields.

16. Unfortunately, attempts to merge the two draft resolutions proposed on science and technology had failed and the text of the draft resolution finally agreed upon and adopted by the Committee reverted to the traditional format, which had not been acceptable to the delegations of the United Kingdom and France. The text of the alternative draft resolution proposed by the German and Brazilian delegations had largely been based on the conclusions of the recent session of the Disarmament Commission, but omitted certain elements of the Chairman's working paper. While the text would have been an acceptable basis for a consolidated draft resolution, it too, like the version proposed by India, failed to deal with certain matters of fundamental concern. Neither of the proposed draft resolutions had made mention of international agreements such as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons or the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and Their Destruction, which addressed the issue of the transfer of high technology in connection with weapons of mass destruction. It was inconceivable that any conclusions on the role of science and technology could ignore such key non-proliferation instruments.

17. There were two schools of thought on the role of qualitative improvements in science and technology with military applications. The delegations of United Kingdom and France took the view that many qualitative improvements could enhance international security and had difficulty in accepting a text which failed to take that into account.

18. It had been hoped that the draft resolution would endorse the Disarmament Commission guidelines on science and technology striking a balance between diverging science and interests and views; every effort would be made during the 1994 session of the Disarmament Commission to achieve those goals. However, in the meantime, since draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.30 did not accurately reflect current thinking on the matter nor address some of the substantive issues of major concern, the delegations of France and the United Kingdom had had no alternative but to abstain from the vote which had taken place on the resolution.

19. With regard to resolution A/C.1/48/L.17, his delegation agreed that radioactive waste could be a source of radioactive material which could be used in radiological weapons; in its view, that was the only aspect which could appropriately be addressed in the Committee or in the Conference on Disarmament. However, his delegation was not willing to define radioactive waste dumping as radiological warfare. In its view, radioactive waste dumping practices could not be regulated by arms control measures and should not be dealt with in the arms control context. The essential issues raised by those practices concerned the environment and public safety and were already being addressed in other forums. Ocean dumping of radioactive waste was governed by the Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter, and

(Mr. Weston, United Kingdom)

the appropriate forum for considering the transboundary movement of radioactive waste was the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

20. Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Australia) said that Australia had supported draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.17, which expressed legitimate concern about the potential hazards underlying any use of nuclear wastes which would constitute radiological warfare and the implications for regional and international security. It had some concerns about the appropriate venue for the consideration of a legally binding instrument; any decisions in that respect would need to take into account the various areas of competence and ongoing work of the Conference on Disarmament, IAEA and the International Maritime Organization. Australia did not wish its vote in favour of the resolution to be interpreted as indicating its opposition to land disposal of radioactive waste which, at the current stage, was the only possible alternative for storing such waste. Australia reaffirmed its unqualified opposition to the dumping of nuclear wastes by any State or organization, such dumping would constitute radiological warfare and would have grave implications for the security of all States.

21. His delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.22; however, it felt that there should be no automatic assumption that technological advances applied to military purposes would necessarily have a negative impact on the security environment. His delegation hoped that the two resolutions on science and technology would be successfully combined at the next session of the General Assembly.

22. Ms. MASON (Canada) said that she associated her delegation with the explanation of position by the representative of Australia.

23. Mr. MADDEN (United States of America) said that his delegation had not participated in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.7/Rev.1 because it felt that disarmament and development were two distinct issues which could not be regarded as organically linked. For that reason, it had not participated in the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development and did not feel that it was bound by the provisions of its final document.

24. His delegation had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.17 although it did not feel that the dumping of radioactive waste could be defined as radiological warfare. Radioactive waste dumping practices could not be regulated by arms control measures and were more appropriately dealt with in forums where environmental and public safety issues were addressed. The appropriate forum for considering the transboundary movement of radiological waste was IAEA. His delegation urged that in future resolutions submitted under the agenda item should avoid reference to issues that were not within the Committee's competence.

25. His delegation had regretfully abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.30; at earlier meetings, it had been able to join in the consensus on a draft resolution which recognized the importance of the issue and highlighted the valuable contributions of scientific and technological applications to the implementation of arms control and disarmament agreements. In the past, the resolution on science and technology had been neutral and balanced and had taken into account the views of all delegations. His delegation did not feel that

(Mr. Madden, United States)

draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.30 would contribute to the successful outcome of the work of the Disarmament Commission's Working Group III in 1994, since it prejudged the outcome of the deliberations and incorporated language from the Chairman's 1993 working paper on science and technology that had not been approved or finalized, thereby giving that paper a certain degree of political standing, while ignoring areas that were of fundamental importance to the United States Government. Furthermore, when referring to the formulation of norms and guidelines, it did not acknowledge the existence of numerous international legal instruments, agreements and national legislative measures. Export control measures existed and should be adopted and implemented by all States.

26. His delegation did not dispute the role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament, and saw great value in promoting the application of science and technology for disarmament-related purposes. However, it could not tacitly endorse a resolution which was unbalanced and threatened to supplant existing technology transfer mechanisms by advocating global norms for the transfer of technology. It hoped that in the following year there would be single resolution on science and technology.

27. Mr. MORADI (Islamic Republic of Iran), referring to the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.30, said that his delegation did not recognize norms and guidelines for the transfer of high technology with military applications which were not negotiated on a universal basis.

28. Mr. BANDURA (Ukraine) said that Ukraine had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.47; his delegation attached great importance to compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements, and welcomed efforts to strengthen confidence-building measures among States. Each party needed not only to fulfil the provisions of treaties but also to be sure that other parties were implementing those provisions. His delegation felt, however, that in order to avoid possible confusion, the words "other obligations" in the fourth, fifth, sixth and tenth preambular paragraphs should have been replaced by the words "obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law", used in the second preambular paragraph.

29. Mr. CHANDRA (India) said that his delegation had worked very closely with the other sponsors with a view to merging the two draft resolutions on science and technology; it hoped that it would be possible to draft a single resolution at the following session.

30. Although his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.30, it felt that it had three major shortcomings. It more or less ignored the negative impact of science and technology on the disarmament process; it made no mention of the need for the Secretary-General to keep the questions of science and technology under review and submit a technical assessment report; and it gave support to ad hoc export control regimes to which his delegation was opposed. However, the resolution paid due attention to progress in science and technology for civilian applications and the transfer of high technology for peaceful purposes, and gave some recognition to the impact of qualitative improvements in technology on international security.

31. Mr. DANIELI (Israel) said that Israel had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.7/Rev.1, but dissociated itself from the reference in the fourth preambular paragraph to the final documents of the Tenth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, since those documents contained provisions and references which did not reflect the recent favourable developments in the Middle East peace process and could prejudice the outcome of future negotiations.

32. Mr. RIVERO (Cuba) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolutions A/C.1/48/L.22 and L.30 but felt that it would have been better to have a single resolution on the subject; it was regrettable that a group of countries had not been able to support either text; his delegation hoped that their positions would become more flexible so that it would be possible to finish work on the item in the Disarmament Commission. His delegation did not support any type of control regime which was decided upon by a group of countries and not negotiated on a multilateral basis.

Cluster 5

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.35

33. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Honduras and the Philippines had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.35.

34. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.35 was adopted.

35. Mr. DANIELI (Israel) said that Israel had, as it had throughout the years, joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.35 on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. However, it felt that the nuclear issue should be dealt with in the full context of the peace process, as well as of all regional security problems. Israel supported the principle of non-proliferation, but felt that it could be achieved only by establishing a mutually verifiable nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. A step-by-step approach must be taken, beginning with confidence- and security-building measures in a climate of peace, leading to actual peace. In due course, the process would be complemented by conventional and non-conventional arms control, with priority assigned to systems that experience had proven to be destructive and destabilizing. The primacy of the peace process must be given due priority, and negotiations on all security issues had to take place within the framework of the peace process.

36. The interrelationship between the peace process and the nuclear issue had been supported in the report of the Secretary-General (A/48/399), in which he had stated: "a nuclear-weapon-free zone cannot be conceived of or implemented in a political vacuum, separate from the process of mutual reconciliation". Regional and extraregional bodies should consider that principle as a prerequisite for serious and meaningful dialogue. The tabling of a resolution on Israeli nuclear armament indicated that a change of heart was needed on the part of some of the actual or potential participants in the peace process.

37. Nuclear-weapon-free zones were meant to reassure neighbouring countries about each other. Precisely for that reason, such zones needed to be created through the initiative and with the agreement of the participating States. The

(Mr. Danieli, Israel)

genesis of the Treaties of Tlatelolco and Rarotonga offered a good guide for the negotiation of credible nuclear-weapon-free zones. However, the international community should not presume to interfere with the duties and rights of individual States of a region with respect to determining the modalities of a possible nuclear-weapon-free zone: all it could usefully do was to welcome the establishment of such zones.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.11

38. Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands) said that his country had decided to sponsor the resolution on chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons on the understanding that it was a procedural resolution designed to support the work of the Preparatory Commission in the future seat of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, The Hague. In response to a proposal put forward at the sponsors' meeting held to consider the draft, a new paragraph had been added, now constituting the eighth preambular paragraph, and identical to the eighth preambular paragraph of the resolution on the same subject adopted at the forty-seventh session. The Islamic Republic of Iran had accepted the text of that resolution and the sponsors had hoped that use of the same language in the 1993 resolution would be conducive to consensus. In his view, however, the new amendment proposed by the Islamic Republic of Iran ran counter to the spirit and letter of the resolution, since it touched on an issue of substance. As the lead sponsor, the Netherlands believed that discussions on substance should take place in The Hague, where, indeed, they were already under way.

39. The sponsors felt that the resolution was well balanced and went a long way towards meeting the concerns expressed by the Islamic Republic of Iran, for whose proposed amendment no support had been forthcoming. In addition, the text of the proposed amendment was not in conformity with the delicate provisions of article XI of the Chemical Weapons Convention. The Netherlands was therefore unable to support the proposed amendment and urged other delegations to vote against it.

40. Mr. MORADI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that, at the sponsors' meeting, his delegation had proposed two preambular paragraphs, the first being the new eighth paragraph and the second recalling the commitment under article XI of the Convention to remove all restrictions incompatible with the obligations undertaken under the Convention. In response to problems experienced by sponsors, his delegation had shortened the second paragraph, brought it closer to the language of the Convention and suggested its incorporation into the previous paragraph. The Islamic Republic of Iran remained strongly attached to the amendment, which, in its view, was entirely consistent with the objectives of the Convention.

41. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) said that his delegation saw considerable virtue in the proposed amendment, particularly in the context of the new eighth preambular paragraph, since the failure to remove all restrictions could inhibit development. His delegation therefore urged the sponsors, including the Islamic Republic of Iran, to continue consultations so that the resolution could be adopted without a vote.

42. After a discussion in which Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan), Mr. RIVERO (Cuba), Mr. PERRI (Brazil), and Ms. MASON (Canada) took part, the CHAIRMAN suggested that, in view of the requests by sponsors that no further action should be taken on the resolution at the current meeting, its consideration would be deferred until a later date.

43. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.15 p.m.